



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/439,545	11/12/1999	DAVID E. WOLF	04037-011001	1775

7590 07/01/2002

DOROTHY P WHELAN  
FISH & RICHARDSON PC PA  
60 SOUTH SIXTH STREET  
SUITE 3300  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

CHAKRABARTI, ARUN K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1634

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2002

#S

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/439,545

Applicant(s)

WOLF, DAVID E.

Examiner

Arun Chakrabarti

Art Unit

1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1634

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restriction*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-21, drawn to a polymer, classified in class 536, subclass 1.11.
  - II. Claims 22-57, drawn to a polymer containing therapeutic substance, classified in class 424, subclass 78.01.
  - III. Claims 58-61, drawn to method of determining analytes by fluorescence, classified in class 250, subclass 458.1.
  - IV. Claim 62, drawn to method of making polymer, classified in class 585, subclass 502.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of polymer of Group I and a polymer containing therapeutic substance of Group II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as making antibodies and nucleic acids and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify

Art Unit: 1634

such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

3. Inventions of Groups I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the method of determining the analyte of Group III can be practiced with the polymer of Group I or by a fluorometer or spectrophotometer or scintillation counter by radioactive method.

4. Inventions of Groups I and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the method of making polymer of Group IV can be used to make polymer of Group I or can be used to make polynucleotides, polymer of carbohydrates and polyamines.

5. Inventions of Groups II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the

Art Unit: 1634

product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the method of determining the analyte of Group III can be practiced with the device of Group II or by a fluorometer or spectrophotometer or scintillation counter by radioactive method.

6. Inventions of Groups II and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the method of making polymer of Group IV can be used to make bioactive polymer of Group I or can be used to make polynucleotides, polymer of carbohydrates and polyamines.

7. Inventions of Groups III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions of method of determining analytes by fluorescence of Group III is not disclosed as capable of use together with method of making polymer of Group IV and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects.

8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1634

9. A telephone call was made to Dorothy Whelan on June 17 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CAR 1.143).

***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun Chakrabarti, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 306-5818. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM from Monday to Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones, can be reached on (703) 308-1152. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-7401.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group analyst Chantae Dessau whose telephone number is (703) 605-1237

Arun Chakrabarti,

Patent Examiner,

June 19, 2002

  
W. Gary Jones  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1600